

been considered before and which will not be integrated into presently existing poverty-related programs.

The sum total of the authorizations asked for would only be something like an additional 11 or 12 percent, by the most optimistic estimate, of the present funds being directed to the areas of the programs other than the new ones set up under this proposed bill.

I believe this proposal is one that has had poor consideration before the committee. I believe it is one that unfortunately has political inspiration and political aspects which outweigh any service aspects to which it should be directed in an effort to solve these problems.

LEGISLATION TO REVISE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join a number of my distinguished colleagues who, under the leadership of my good friend and outstanding public servant from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] have introduced legislation to revise our immigration and naturalization laws.

Ever since coming to Congress, I have sought to sponsor and fight for legislation which would revamp existing statutes in the most sensible way.

Never before, however, have I been more pleased with legislation than I am with the present comprehensive bill, which will overhaul the quota system, abolish the national origins basis, and set in motion a number of reforms that are worthy of this great Nation. As the son of parents born on a foreign soil, I feel that the implicit improvements contained in this legislation will right the number of inequities that have plagued our Nation.

I have called attention to these inequities on occasions too numerous in the past to mention. Needless to say, this legislation should be considered a "high priority" matter, and one that should be examined in depth during this session of Congress.

It seems to me to be the best bill ever introduced on the subject of revamping the McCarran-Walter Act.

Let us look at certain basic facts regarding our present policies. The most obvious one is that as long as the quota system is based on national origins, it is bound to have disastrous consequences.

Because it is based on national origins, the resultant discrimination against southern and eastern Europeans is most discouraging.

In this bill I am introducing today, the United States would establish an annual total quota according to the 1960 census. This would result in an annual quota of 300,000.

While this will be interpreted by enemies of this legislation as an opening of the floodgates, it will—in actuality—in-

crease the number of immigrants to this country by about 50,000. This is due to the fact that the present allotment of 154,000 is exceeded by an additional 100,000 through special legislation.

The changes enumerated on the floor by my colleagues on Monday will, I am certain, reduce the number of hardships created by the program through a distribution system among the several quota areas in proportion to the actual immigration into the United States chargeable to each area between July 1, 1920, and the date of this act's enactment. While there are many features that could be stressed on the quota system outlined in the legislation, I would also like to stress two other major features of the bill, namely, the preference for parents of U.S. citizens and the provision for the relief of world refugee and Communist escapee problems.

This bill would include in the non-quota category parents of U.S. citizens, the same nonquota system that is now accorded to a child and spouse of a citizen. We need not stress here the importance of the family unit for it seems obvious that parents of citizens should be included in the high priority list.

And finally, I would like to make certain comments regarding the refugee provisions of this legislation. The bill defines "refugee" as an alien who—because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion—has fled from any Communist territory or from a country of the Middle East. The definition also includes persons who are victims of war, political upheaval and natural calamity and who are unable to return to their former homes.

The bill would empower the President to parole into the United States 10,000 refugees during serious emergency situations such as the 1956 Hungarian revolt. They would then become eligible to apply for permanent residence after a period of time. Apart from these emergency situations, 20,000 special refugee visas would be authorized over a 2-year period in order to relieve pressure on various refugee concentration areas.

And there are many other features of the legislation that I would like to stress. However, in the interests of preserving space, I call attention to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in the section by section analysis of the bill in the Record of Monday, June 1.

Suffice it to say at this point, the legislation is vitally needed and a matter of utmost urgency. We have tolerated a system that has not met the serious problems in a manner befitting the lofty goals of this Nation, a nation, I might add, of immigrants.

Both party platforms in 1960 called for liberalization of our immigration laws. I had the great privilege of authoring this platform plank in 1960. We have the opportunity at this time to demonstrate our responsibility by adopting this legislation. The archaic stipulations contained in the present act have longed damaged the reputation of this Nation.

Let us begin to create the necessary machinery. I urge an immediate response to this legislation.

IMPORTANCE OF KEEPING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS INFORMED OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT ACTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a recent incident affecting Luzerne County in Pennsylvania, which I have long represented in the Congress, is indicative of a problem of serious proportions with implications far beyond this county, indeed beyond the congressional district of any Member or single State represented by Members of the other House.

On November 22, 1962, the Housing and Home Finance Agency issued an announcement that the Urban Renewal Administration had approved a grant of \$75,000 to Luzerne County under the urban planning assistance program to help finance comprehensive urban planning. As the representative of the 11th District of Pennsylvania, I was informed of this grant in advance of its being known generally to the public. This is a courtesy that Members of the House expect from agencies of the executive branch and it enables us to follow with intelligence and proper concern the effects on our own constituents of the programs of the executive branch authorized by legislation of the Congress of which we are Members. To my astonishment, however, about the first of this month, I learned through newspaper publicity that an additional grant under this same program amounting to \$60,000 had been made to Luzerne County to help develop a comprehensive mass transportation plan comparable to that currently being developed in adjoining Lackawanna County. No notice of any kind was given to me in advance of this action nor indeed after the action had occurred except in response to my inquiry addressed to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The explanation then given to me was that this additional grant of \$60,000 was not a new action, but rather an amendment of the action of November 1962, and normally would not be made the subject of public announcement or of notification to a Member of Congress. Such amendatory actions, even though they may involve substantial amounts of additional assistance given by the executive branch of the Government to our communities, are apparently considered as routine in nature to be handled by an interchange between executives of the Federal agency granting the assistance and the local agency receiving the assistance. This attitude appears to me all the more remarkable in this instance because the additional \$60,000 granted was for an entirely different kind of planning from that contemplated in the original grant made in 1962, being intended to enable Luzerne County to collect detailed land

use data, make a street conditions inventory, a traffic facility survey, a public transportation study, including an airport facilities study and evaluation. Moreover, I, as the Congressman representing this district, had known of discussions of such proposed studies, which would require Federal assistance, had inquired about their progress on more than one occasion, and had asked to be informed of actions taken regarding them. My request for this notification was ignored.

This incident occurred in a program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is an Agency which I have reason to believe endeavors to cooperate fully with the Members of Congress on matters affecting their constituents, and if its procedures have been at fault in the incidents I have cited, I believe it will be that Agency's purpose to correct those procedures as may be needed. The failure to keep Members of Congress properly informed of executive department actions affecting their constituents is a problem that pervades the executive branch of the Government and one which requires corrective measures of a general nature.

How these conditions have come about is understandable. They have been developing slowly but surely over a number of years, paralleling the growing sense of responsibility on the part of the Congress of the United States to deal effectively with the increasingly numerous, serious, and complex problems of the urban areas of our Nation. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations reports that Federal annual expenditures for aid to State and local governments at the beginning of the 1930's aggregated only about \$200 million a year. In the budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1965 such Federal-aid expenditures are estimated at \$10.6 billion. These funds, implementing programs of vital importance to the communities of America, are dispensed through some 80 programs, administered by about 16 major Federal executive departments and agencies. One of the most significant actions by the Congress in this field was passage of the Housing Act of 1949 which combined many earlier programs with new measures of slum clearance and urban renewal. Later there were authorized programs of urban planning assistance and special programs designed to meet the housing needs of elderly persons. In the Housing Act of 1961, after reviewing the effects of all earlier measures, the Congress enacted the most far-reaching piece of urban and housing legislation ever approved. This act enlarged, modified, and extended existing programs and added additional programs such as those designed to deal with the problems of urban mass transportation, the preservation of open space in rapidly urbanizing areas, and housing for moderate income families, whose needs had heretofore largely been neglected. Meanwhile, other kinds of programs were authorized and responsibility for them lodged in other departments and agencies to enable the Federal Government to do its part in solving problems in such

fields as transportation, water and air pollution, sewage treatment and disposal, health, educational and recreation facilities, and many others.

To execute these various programs, there has been required an increasing number of professionals of various specialties, in the employ of local public agencies and in the employ of agencies of the Federal Government. These are the designers—the planners—the consultants—the technicians of various skills—the administrators and a vast assortment of sub-executives and professional staff people. These highly talented people have constituted themselves into various groups and bodies organized more or less professionally along the lines of their several skills, all bound together into the fraternity of those who deal in one way or another in the problems of urban communities. These are the "pro's" who have come to think of these widely diversified programs and activities as being their own proper field of activity, which they jealously guard and within which they seem to preempt the functions of policymaking, the setting of standards, and the development of procedures.

It was perhaps inevitable that this should have occurred. And these people are performing a valuable service for their country. But they are now standing in great danger, and the praiseworthy efforts to which they give their talents are now standing in great danger, from a kind of arrogance that has led them to believe that they hold dominance in what they consider to be their exclusive areas of competency. They are tending more and more to lose sight of the fact that every authority they have and every dollar of money they use to finance their projects proceeds out of the initiative of those charged with political responsibility in our American communities, in our States, and—at the Federal level—in the Congress of the United States. In those programs which are dependent upon Federal assistance, nothing can be done that is not authorized by the Congress. A Member of the House of Representatives who votes on a bill enlarging, or possibly restricting, the authority of a Federal agency to extend assistance to the communities of his own district and to other communities of the United States cannot escape the responsibility of the consequences of his actions. He must know, both in general and in particular, how the authorities so granted are being used by the Federal agencies. This is mandatory if he is to have a sound basis for judgment when he is called upon to cast his vote on the renewal, extension, or possibly the termination of such authorities. This is a fact that many technicians in the field of urban affairs seem to have forgotten in what may be termed their professional pride and their sense of exclusive jurisdiction in the fields of their specialties. They all too frequently seem to feel that a Federal agency is responsible primarily to them rather than to the Congress of the United States. This can be a fatal misunderstanding.

Strengthening the trend which I have described and which I deplore is the

tendency of the professional career service employee of the Federal Government, feeling secure under the protection of our civil service system, to make his primary affiliations and to give his first loyalty to that body of specialists, technicians, and professionals which he seems to regard as a kind of private constituency of his own, distinct and apart from the more general constituency of the whole people to whom the Member of Congress holds himself responsible and to whom he must give his own loyalty. Between the careerists in Government, who consider themselves immune to political considerations, who have survived changes of administration in the National Government, and who have persisted through various reorganizations of their own agencies, there is an alliance with those who are building their careers outside the Federal Government by virtue of the financial benefits which flow from Federal agencies into local programs of housing, planning, urban renewal, and public works of all kinds and descriptions. A part of this alliance also is many a consultant who operates, not on the Federal payroll nor on the payroll of any government or local public agency, but as an independent professional and as such has built a remunerative occupation as an intermediary between the donor Federal agency and the beneficiary local body.

Perhaps the most striking result of these developments over a period of years is the fact that many of these worthy programs, supported in their initial stages by Members of Congress dedicated to the solution of urban problems, are now lacking any assurance that the Congress of the United States will support their further expansion and development. Frequently the first knowledge that a Member of Congress has of a program which has been initiated in a community within his own constituency with the aid of the Federal Government is the occasion when it runs into difficulties that threaten its very continuance. These programs necessarily deal with human and property rights, with the accustomed ways of living and doing business in local communities. They affect most drastically those of our people who are most impoverished and most in need of help. Yet all too often the specialists of these programs show least understanding for and consideration of those most directly and sometimes tragically affected by their efforts. It is the Member of Congress to whom such people appeal for assistance. Is it any wonder that, at this time in history, the Members of Congress who are called upon to vote again for the enlargement of these already sweeping authorities pause and consider whether or not they are serving the people's interests as they were originally conceived. I believe they are in general serving the public good, but I believe that there is a growing misunderstanding and distrust of their purposes.

Unless those responsible at the Federal level and at the local level for the execution of these programs are able to demonstrate a greater confidence in the Congress and a greater willingness to provide to its Members current informa-